What is the legal effect of a patent? Jay v. Van Bibber, 94 Md. 690; Armstrong v. Bittinger, 47 Md. 108; Brown v. Shilling, 9 Md. 80.

By a patent, the state warrants that the grant contains the number of acres specified. How a deficiency is made up. Hoffman v. Johnson, 1 Bl. 103. See also Tolson v. Lanahan, 2 H. & J. 175.

A patent passes nothing unless the land described is susceptible of location. Description in certificate of survey. Wilson v. Inloes, 6 Gill, 121. See also Budd v.

Brooke, 3 Gill, 198.

A patent, when granted, relates back to date of warrant. Legislature may direct A patent, when granted, relates back to date of warrant. Legislature may direct commissioner to issue patent, but cannot annul patent already issued. Smith v. Devecmon, 30 Md 481; Owings v. Norwood, 2 H. & J. 96; Chesapeake, etc., Canal Co. v. B. & O. R. R. Co., 4 G. & J. 6; Garretson v. Cole, 2 H. & McH. 459. Cf. Attorney-General v. Snowden, 1 H. & J. 332; Kelly v. Greenfield, 2 H. & McH. 121. Patentee of land covered by navigable water takes subject to public rights of fishery and navigation. Hammond v. Inloes, 4 Md. 173; Baltimore v. McKim, 3 Bl. 453; Wilson v. Inloes, 11 G. & J. 359; Browne v. Kennedy, 5 H. & J. 195.

A patent issued under a presumption that only certain lands are included in it is good as to lands properly included. Jarrett v. West, 1 H. & J. 501. Cf. State v. Reed, 4 H. & McH. 11.

A legal title is acquired by a patent although the certificate of survey did not lay six months in the land office. Proof that a certificate of survey was forged. Boreing v. Singery, 4 H. & McH. 403, and note (b).

Where the applicant dies after the return of the certificate and before the grant, the patent is invalid. Potter v. Purnell, 1 H. & McH. 208.

Caveats.

Nature of a caveat and grounds upon which it may be entered. Cunningham v. Browning, 1 Bl. 299.

What is a sufficient caveat? Letter and verbal notice, held insufficient. Jay v.

Van Bibber, 94 Md. 689.

Caveat will not be dismissed because caveator fails to show an interest in matter in dispute. Armstrong v. Bittinger, 47 Md. 111; Patterson v. Gelston, 23 Md. 446 (overruling on this point, Gittings v. Moale, 21 Md. 135); Chisholm v. Perry, 4 Md.

After a patent has been issued, the authority of the land office is ended, and no caveat can be filed. Jay v. Van Bibber, 94 Md. 690; Steyer v. Hoye, 12 G. & J. 203; Cunningham v. Browning, 1 Bl. 321.

Fraud.

A patent fraudulently obtained is void, and the estate passes to a second patentee. Boring v. Lemmon, 5 H. & J. 225.

For patents annulled in equity because obtained fraudulently and contrary to rules of land office, see Smith v. State, 2 H. & McH. 247; Proprietary v. Jenings, 1 H. & McH. 92; Hoye v. Johnston, 2 Gill, 316; Attorney-General v. Snowden, 1 H. & J. 332; Seward v. Hicks, 1 H. & McH. 22. Cf. Garretson v. Cole, 1 H. & J. 370, and Cook v. Carroll, 6 Md. 104; Railroad v. Hoye, 2 Bl. 261, note (b). See also Singery v. Attorney-General, 2 H. & J. 487; Norwood v. Attorney-General, 2 H. & McH. 201; Smith v. State use of Yates, 2 H. & McH. 244.

An equitable title to vacent lands will prevail over a legal title obtained by fraud

An equitable title to vacant lands will prevail over a legal title obtained by fraud.

Hoye v. Johnston, 2 Gill, 292.

The proprietary only can complain of a fraud practiced on him. Wilson v. Inloes, 6 Gill, 121.

Generally.

The proceedings of the commissioner may be reviewed or controlled by courts. The proceedings of the commissioner may be reviewed or controlled by courts. The pendency of proceedings to obtain a patent does not oust jurisdiction of equity, though such jurisdiction will not ordinarily be exercised. Goodsell v. Lawson, 42 Md. 370. See also West v. Jarrett, 1 H. & J. 538; Ringgold v. Malott, 1 H. & J. 316. Where two certificates of survey and grants bear same date, he who got the earlier warrant prevails, although other party's grant was actually issued first. Karn

v. Hughes, 3 H. & J. 210. See also Attorney-General v. Jarrett, 2 H. & J. 472.

The commissioner's duty under this section where there is no contest is ministerial only; contra, if there is a contest. Jay v. Van Bibber, 94 Md. 689. See also Cook v. Carroll, 6 Md. 112.

When a patent will be issued. Day v. Day, 22 Md. 538; Chapman v. Hoskins, 2 Md. Ch. 486; The Railroad v. Hoye, 2 Bl. 263; Jones v. Bradley, 4 Md. Ch. 167; Dorothy v. Hillert, 9 Md. 573; Ridgely v. Johnson, 1 Bl. 316, note (f).

A patent which has been illegally vacated in equity will sustain ejectment. Beale

v. Digges, 1 H. & McH. 26.

The payment of composition money does not establish a contract between the state and the applicant. Effect of such payment. Day v. Day, 22 Md. 538. See also Attorney General v. Snowden, 1 H. & J. 332; Steuart v. Donaldson, 5 H. & J. 429.